REMARKS

The Examiner's communication dated February 24, 2004 has been received and carefully considered. In conformance with the applicable statutory requirements, this paper constitutes a complete reply and/or a bona fide attempt to advance the application to allowance. Specifically, Applicant has amended claims 13, 21 and 24. In addition, detailed arguments in support of patentability are presented. Reexamination and/or reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-12 stand allowed.

Claims 13-14, 16, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Burum (U.S. Patent No. 3,729,868).

Claims 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lambertz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,030,160).

Claims 15, 17, 19 and 20 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

The Claims Distinguish Patentably Over the Reference(s) of Record

Claim 13, as amended, calls for at least one track defined between first and second housing pieces and between one of the first and second housing pieces and a roller assembly. Claim 13 further calls for a threaded fastener selectively and *only linearly* adjusting a position of a roller assembly in relation to the first and second housing pieces along the at least one track. It is submitted that none of the references of record disclose nor fairly suggest a threaded fastener that selectively and only linearly adjusts a position of a roller assembly in relation to first and second housing pieces along at least one track. Burum, the reference applied to claim 13, discloses a roller bracket 56 that pivotally moves about a pivot pin 60. There is thus no disclosure in the applied references of a threaded fastener that <u>selectively and only linearly</u> adjusts a position of the roller assembly along the track. Pivotal movement is not the same as linear movement. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 13 and claims 14-20 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably over the references of record.

Claim 21, as amended, calls for a track including guide members mounted on at least one of a roller housing, a first side and a second side of a corner member frame and protruding into a cavity defined between the first and second sides for engagement with grooves defined on another of the roller housing, the first side and the second side.

Claim 21 further calls for the guide members and grooves to define the track along which the roller housing moves. The Examiner indicated that the inclusion of a track having a guide members on a roller housing and housing pieces matingly received within grooves on either the roller housing and housing pieces was deemed allowable subject matter. (Office Action at page 3). Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 21 and claims 22-23 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably over the references of record.

Claim 24, as amended, calls for a roller assembly disposed within a corner bracket including an adjusting means selectively moving the roller assembly along a linear path between a first position and a second position wherein the path is defined between at least one groove and rib which are in slidable engagement with each other, the path being located between the corner bracket and the roller assembly. It is submitted that none of the references of record disclose an adjusting means selectively moving a roller assembly along a linear path. Both of the applied references, Lambertz et al. and Burum, disclose pivotal movement about a pivot pin. Thus, there is no disclosure of an adjusting means that moves a roller assembly along a linear path. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 24 and claim 25 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably over the references of record.

CONCLUSION

All formal and informal matters having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that the proposed claim changes clearly place the application in condition for allowance, defining over any fair teaching attributable to the references of record. The claims do not raise new issues requiring further search or consideration since the claimed subject matter is merely restated in a manner that is fully supported by the specification as filed. Alternatively, if the Examiner is of the view that the proposed amendments do not place the application in clear condition for allowance, entry is respectfully requested for purposes of appeal since it reduces the issues for consideration on appeal. Accordingly, entry of the amendment is respectfully requested and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

21 May 2004

N:\PTOZ200013\AMD0002551V001.doc

Jay F. Moldovanyi, Reg. No. 29,678 Erik J. Overberger, Reg. No. 48,556 1100 Superior Avenue 7th Floor Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

(216) 861-5582

STOP
e date
ervice
IENT, "
/